



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/559,704	04/27/2000	Michael D. Zoekler	R029 1056 (7137-US)	2557
26158	7590	08/25/2008		EXAMINER
WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC			HARMON, CHRISTOPHER R	
ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING 32ND FLOOR				
P.O. BOX 7037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANTA, GA 30357-0037			3721	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/559,704	Applicant(s) ZOECKLER, MICHAEL D.
	Examiner Christopher R. Harmon	Art Unit 3721

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9-11,13-15,25-29 and 31-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9-11,13-15,25-29 and 31-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/23/08; 5/12/08
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 5-7, 11, 13, 16, 25, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walsh (US 5,746,871).

Walsh discloses a method for forming carton blanks comprising advancing a web of paperboard 2 along a path; progressively applying and adhering at least a first and second ribbon of reinforcing material 6 with a width less than the paperboard to edge panel portions; the paperboard has longitudinally extending panel portions defined by fold lines 54; see figures 2 and 5-6. Carton blanks are cut from the laminated structure and later formed into a carton (score lines 54 are adjacent to edge of ribbon 6) to form individual carton blanks for receiving articles (see figures 1 and 2, column 1, lines 24-65). Because the layers are added thicknesses to an original web, the resulting structure is considered reinforced.

An additional ribbon 10 is applied to the composite layers in order to adhere/laminate the structure together forming a double thickness of reinforcement; see figure 1.

Regarding claims 7 and 32, central ribbon 6 is considered overlying an intermediate panel portion as claimed and is applied in order to provide for two adjacent blanks after

the cutting procedure, however note that the longitudinal fold lines 54 encompass either side of the are adhered to the opposing edges therefore overlie substantially but not beyond the intermediate panel portion; see figure 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh (US 5,746,871) in view of Decottignies et al. (US 5,097,651).

Walsh does not directly disclose printing indicia on the ribbon, however Decottignies et al. teach printing indicia on reinforcing material 5 before adhesion to web 4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include printing indicia as desired for product enhancement.

5. Claims 2, 14-15, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh (US 5,746,871) in view of McNown (US 5,447,270).

Walsh does not directly disclose using paperboard (trim or otherwise) for the reinforcing ribbons 6. However, McNown teaches manufacturing a paperboard carton with a reinforcing panel portions made of paperboard strips along score lines in order to increase structural integrity. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art to use a reinforcing ribbon of paperboard (trim, cull, etc.) as taught by McNown to reinforce support to the cartons of Walsh along score/fold lines.

6. Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 13-15, 25-29, 31-33 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claff (US 2,008,608) in view of McNown (US 5,447,270).

Claff discloses a method for forming carton blanks comprising advancing a continuous web of non-corrugated paperboard 1 along a path; progressively applying/laminating, with an adhesive, a plurality of ribbons of reinforcing material 2 with a width less than the paperboard substantially overlying substantially all of selected panel portions 3 (ie. portions to become panels in the final construction as interpreted by the Board of Patent Appeals); the paperboard is then scored and cut into individual carton blanks and then are formed into cartons for receiving articles (see figures 1-2 and 6-7). Reinforcing strips 2 are progressively folded/sealed/adhered to opposed edge portions of the paperboard web 1; see figure 6 however are disclosed as extending beyond the bottom edge fold line; see column 2, lines 30-37.

McNown however in addition to directly reinforcing fold/score lines teaches aligning reinforcing strips along fold/score lines for reinforcing selected panel portions (including an intermediate); see figures 1a-1c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include positioning reinforcing strips along the fold lines in the invention to Claff in order to sufficiently increase the structural integrity with reduced cost.

Regarding claims 6 and 33, Claff teaches the possibility of further layer 14 to be added atop first and second reinforcing strips 2; see page 2, left column, lines 38+.

7. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claff (US 2,008,608) in view of McNown and further view of Lang (US 5,147,480).

Claff does not disclose printing on the reinforcing strips however Lang discloses printing on reinforcing strips; see abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include printing as taught by Lang on the reinforcing strips in the invention to Claff order to provide graphics/indicia according to a customer's needs.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 7/14/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the definition of a panel portion note that during patent examination, the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 320,322 (Fed. Cir. 1999). In determining the patentability of claims, the PTO gives claim language its broadest reasonable interpretation" consistent with the specification and claims. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997). See MPEP § 904.1. Limitations not appearing in the claims cannot be relied upon for patentability; *In re Self*, 671 F.2d 1344, 1348 (CCPA 1982). Particular embodiments appearing in the written description are not to be read into the claims if the claim language is broader than the embodiment; see *Superguide Corp. v. DirecTV Enterprises, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 870, 875 (Fed.Cir. 2004). Previous rejections under 35 USC 112 have been removed due to the amendments filed changing the definition of a panel portion see transcribed Oral Argument, page 3, lines 19+ "A panel portion is a portion of the web that ill become a

panel separated by fold lines." Claim 1 now defines it as "longitudinally extending panel portions that will each become a plurality of panels, the longitudinally extending panel portions being separated by longitudinal fold lines"; see step a.

Walsh is considered to disclose reinforcing web 2 by adhesion of strips 6 via laminate cover 10 with glue applied thereto. The strips 6 are effectively sandwiched and adhered between layers 2 and 10 by a glue layer 22.

ad·here -verb (used without object)

1. to stay attached; stick fast; cleave; cling (usually fol. by *to*):

Figure 2 of Walsh shows a wider strip 6 in the middle which is then cut so as to provide edge reinforcement sections extending on the two opposing longitudinally extending sides. Fold lines 54 are "formed in the relatively rigid material 2"; see column 3, lines 43+. There is no mention of fold lines 54 being formed in strip material 6. Note that the discussion of cut lines is specific to each layer see column 4.

Regarding McNown, the functionality of the strips of Walsh do more than provide a flexible barrier between the layers as argued.

McNown clearly shows reinforcing longitudinal panel portions by reinforcing only adjacent portions of a score line. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been able to use this teaching for the predictable outcome of reinforcing the selected portions as desired. Note that a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond that person's skill. While evaluating obviousness, one must ask whether the improvement is more than the

predictable use of prior-art elements according to their established functions; see *KSR Int. v. Teleflex 550 US* (2007).

To determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the way a patent claims, it will often be necessary to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; to the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and to the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art; *ibid.*

The analysis need not seek out precise teachings directed to the challenged claimed specific subject matter, for a court can consider the inferences and creative steps a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ. Under the correct analysis, any need or problem known in the field and addressed by the patent can provide a reason for combining the elements in the manner claimed; *ibid.*

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Harmon whose telephone number is (571) 272-4461. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on (571) 272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher R Harmon/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3721